



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

1751 ✓
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov
USPO 02 04

FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW
GARRETT & DUNNER
1300 I STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC 20005

COPY MAILED

FEB 20 2004

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Marie-Pascale Audousset :
Application No. 09/485,904 : ON PETITION
Filed: 22 March, 2000 :
Attorney Docket No. 05725.0545 :

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b),¹ filed on 8 January, 2004, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

This application became abandoned on 12 November, 2003, for failure to file an appeal brief in response to the Notice of Appeal filed on a proper reply to the final Office action mailed on 11 April, 2003, which set a two (2) month shortened period for reply. A five month extension of time and a request for reconsideration were filed on 10 November, 2003. The request did

¹Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continued examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof. In an application abandoned for failure to pay the publication fee, the required reply must include payment of the publication fee.

(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

(3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

not place the case in condition for allowance, and an Advisory Action was mailed on 11 December, 2003. Notice of Abandonment was mailed on 16 December, 2003.

On 8 January, 2004, the present petition was filed, accompanied by a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) requesting consideration of the request for reconsideration filed on 10 November, 2003, as the submission required under 37 CFR 1.114.

The statement contained in the instant petition does not set forth that the entire delay from the due date of the required reply to the date of the filing of a grantable petition was unintentional as required by 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3). However, the statement contained in the instant petition is being so construed. Petitioner **must** notify the Office if this is not a correct interpretation.

The application will be forwarded to Technology Center 1700 for consideration of the RCE and submission.

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (703)308-6918.



Douglas I. Wood
Senior Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions